

# **EXHIBIT 372**

Page 364

1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
3 SHERMAN DIVISION  
4  
5 THE STATE OF TEXAS, ET AL,  
6 Plaintiffs,  
7 vs. CIVIL NO. 4:20-CV-957-SDJ  
8 GOOGLE LLC,  
9 Defendants.  
10 \_\_\_\_\_ /  
11  
12  
13 HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL  
14 VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION of NIRMAL JAYARAM, VOLUME II  
15 Redwood City, California  
16 May 21, 2024  
17 9:11 a.m.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23 Stenographically reported by:  
24 JENNY L. GRIFFIN, RMR, CSR, CRR, CCRR, CRC  
25 CSR No. 3969

1                   Do you recall that?

2                   A. Yes.

3                   MR. BITTON: Objection to form.

4                   BY MR. HILLEGAS:

5                   Q. When you referred to the two versions of  
6                   Project Bell in your declaration, Version 1 was  
7                   Global Bernanke; right?

8                   MR. BITTON: Objection to form.

9                   THE WITNESS: That's my recollection.

10                   BY MR. HILLEGAS:

11                   Q. Version 2 was what we now know as -- as  
12                   Project Bell; correct?

13                   MR. BITTON: Objection to form.

14                   THE WITNESS: Yes. That's my recollection.

15                   BY MR. HILLEGAS:

16                   Q. Now, Project Bell engaged in three actions;  
17                   right?

18                   MR. BITTON: Objection to form.

19                   THE WITNESS: So if we are referring to  
20                   what you just referred as the second version, yes,  
21                   there were three -- three different treatments  
22                   applied on publishers that we detected as calling  
23                   AdWords multiple times through AdX.

24                   BY MR. HILLEGAS:

25                   Q. Those three actions were to disable

1 Project Bernanke from bidding, to set a limit on how  
2 high the bid would be based on bids from the prior  
3 week, and that Google Ads would not buy inventory  
4 from the multicaller publishers on third-party  
5 exchanges; right?

6 MR. BITTON: Objection to form.

7 THE WITNESS: That sounds right.

8 (Exhibit 214 was marked for  
9 identification and is attached to the  
10 transcript.)

11 BY MR. HILLEGAS:

12 Q. Now, for this next part, I'm going to --  
13 I'll hand you the declaration. This is State's  
14 Exhibit -- I believe we're at 214. And it is  
15 GOOG-AT-MDL-008842383.

16 And is this the declaration that you wrote  
17 for the Virginia case, sir?

18 A. Yes. It appears so.

19 Q. And if you could go to page 5, which is  
20 Bates Number 387 in the bottom corner.

21 A. Okay.

22 Q. So paragraph 17 is what we were discussing,  
23 and at the end there's a footnote.

24 Do you see that, sir?

25 A. I see it.

Page 398

1       essentially lower than bid to the optimal value to  
2       be submitted to AdX as well; right?

3           A.    Yes.

4           Q.    And if Poirot was lowering the bid to be  
5       submitted to AdX, it's applying a multiplier of less  
6       than 1; correct?

7           MR. BITTON:   Objection to form.

8           THE WITNESS:   At this time the bid was no  
9       longer just a multiplier.   But, yes.   My expectation  
10      is that the bids that get submitted to the exchange  
11      would be less than the bids that the advertiser  
12      input in the front-end.

13       BY MR. HILLEGAS:

14           Q.    When did Poirot start reducing the bids  
15      that were submitted to AdX?

16           A.    My expectation is that that would have  
17      happened once AdX shifted to the unified first-price  
18      auction.

19           Q.    Do you know when AdX shifted to the unified  
20      first-price auction?

21           A.    To my recollection, it was close to  
22      September 2019.

23           Q.    You said September 2019?

24           A.    Yes.

25           Q.    If we can look at paragraph 36 on page 9.

Page 614

1

---oOo---

2

3 I, JENNY L. GRIFFIN, hereby certify:

4

5 That I am a certified shorthand reporter in and

6 for the County of Alameda, State of California;

7

8 Prior to being examined, NIRMAL JAYARAM, PhD,  
9 the witness named in the foregoing deposition, was by  
10 me duly sworn to testify to the truth, the whole  
11 truth, and nothing but the truth; that said  
12 deposition was taken pursuant to notice at the time  
13 and place therein set forth, and was taken down by me  
14 in stenotype and thereafter transcribed by means of  
15 computer-aided transcription, and that said  
deposition is a true record of the testimony given by  
the witness.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I further certify that I am neither counsel for  
nor related in any way to any party to said action,  
nor otherwise interested in the outcome thereof.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto subscribed  
my name May 22, 2024.



JENNY L. GRIFFIN, CSR #3969

Certified Shorthand Reporter

Page 616

1 DECLARATION UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY

2 Case Name: The State Of Texas, et al. v. Google LLC

3 Name of Witness: NIRMAL JAYARAM, PhD

4 Date of Deposition: May 21, 2024

5 Job No.: 6710582

6

7 I, NIRMAL JAYARAM, PhD, hereby certify  
8 under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State  
9 of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

10 Executed this \_\_\_\_\_ day of  
11 \_\_\_\_\_, 2024, at \_\_\_\_\_.

12

13

14

15

16

NIRMAL JAYARAM, PhD

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

**HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL**

**ERRATA SHEET FOR THE TRANSCRIPT OF:**

Case Name: *The State of Texas, et al. v. Google LLC*, 4:20-cv-00957-SDJ (E.D. Tex.)

Deposition Date: May 21, 2024

Deponent: Nirmal Jayaram

**CORRECTIONS**

<b>Page</b>	<b>Line</b>	<b>Change</b>	<b>Reason</b>
372	9	Change “First-Place” to “first price”	Transcription error
379	23	Change “range of 0.621” to “range of 0.6-1”	Transcription error
390	18	Change “measure an attribute” to “measure and attribute”	Transcription error
405	24	Change “He” to “Eli Gadd”	Transcription error
464	18	Change “want” to “won”	Transcription error
538	24	Change “was a product analyst” to “was a product analyst lead”	Transcription error
576	11	“unified pricing goals” to “unified pricing rules”	Transcription error

I have inspected and read my deposition and have listed all changes and corrections above, along with my reasons therefor.

Date: 07/15/2024

Signature: Nirmal Jayaram